arXiv:1703.01150v1 [math.AC] 3 Mar 2017

On the intersection graph of ideals of $\mathbb{Z}_m$ *

S. Khojasteh

Department of Mathematics, Lahijan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Lahijan, Iran

Abstract

Let $m > 1$ be an integer, and let $I(\mathbb{Z}_m)^*$ be the set of all non-zero proper ideals of $\mathbb{Z}_m$. The intersection graph of ideals of $\mathbb{Z}_m$, denoted by $G(\mathbb{Z}_m)$, is a graph with vertices $I(\mathbb{Z}_m)^*$ and two distinct vertices $I, J \in I(\mathbb{Z}_m)^*$ are adjacent if and only if $I \cap J \neq 0$. Let $n > 1$ be an integer and $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. In this paper, we introduce and study a kind of graph structure of $\mathbb{Z}_m$, denoted by $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. It is the undirected graph with the vertex set $I(\mathbb{Z}_m)^*$, and two distinct vertices I and J are adjacent if and only if $I\mathbb{Z}_n \cap J\mathbb{Z}_n \neq 0$. Clearly, $G_m(\mathbb{Z}_m) = G(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. We obtain some graph theoretical properties of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ and we compute some of its numerical invariants, namely girth, independence number, domination number, maximum degree and chromatic index. We also determine all integer numbers n and m for which $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is Eulerian.

1 Introduction

Let R be a commutative ring, and $I(R)^*$ be the set of all non-zero proper ideals of R. There are many papers on assigning a graph to a ring R, for instance see [1], [2], [5] and [6]. Also the intersection graphs of some algebraic structures such as groups, rings and modules have been studied by several authors, see [3, 9, 10]. In [9], the intersection graph of ideals of R, denoted by $G(R)$, was introduced as the graph with vertices $I(R)^*$ and for distinct $I, J \in I(R)^*$, the vertices I and J are adjacent if and only if $I \cap J \neq 0$. Also in [3], the intersection graph of submodules of an R-module M, denoted by $G(M)$, is defined to be the graph whose vertices are the non-zero proper submodules of M and two

* *Key words*: intersection graph, independent set, dominating set, chromatic index, Eulerian graph.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 05C15, 05C25, 05C45, 05C69.

E-mail addresses: s_khojasteh@liau.ac.ir (S. Khojasteh).

distinct vertices are adjacent if and only if they have non-zero intersection. Let $n, m > 1$ be integers and $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. In this paper, we associate a graph to $\mathbb{Z}_m$, in which the vertex set is being the set of all non-zero proper ideals of $\mathbb{Z}_m$, and two distinct vertices I and J are adjacent if and only if $I\mathbb{Z}_n \cap J\mathbb{Z}_n \neq 0$. We denote this graph by $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. Clearly, if $n = m$, then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is exactly the same as the intersection graph of ideals of $\mathbb{Z}_m$. This implies that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a generalization of $G(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. As usual, $\mathbb{Z}_m$ denotes the integers modulo m.

Now, we recall some definitions and notations on graphs. Let G be a graph with the vertex set $V(G)$ and the edge set $E(G)$. Then we say the order of G is $|V(G)|$ and the size of G is $|E(G)|$. Suppose that $x, y \in V(G)$. If x and y are adjacent, then we write x — y. We denote by $deg(x)$ the degree of a vertex x in G. Also, we denote the maximum degree of G by $\Delta(G)$. We recall that a *path* between x and y is a sequence $x = v_0$ — v_1 — $\cdots$ — $v_k = y$ of vertices of G such that for every i with $1 \leq i \leq k$, the vertices v_{i-1} and v_i are adjacent and $v_i \neq v_j$, where $i \neq j$. We say that G is *connected* if there is a path between any two distinct vertices of G. For vertices x and y of G, let $d(x, y)$ be the length of a shortest path from x to y ($d(x, x) = 0$ and $d(x, y) = \infty$ if there is no path between x and y). The *diameter* of G, $diam(G)$, is the supremum of the set $\{d(x, y) : x \text{ and } y \text{ are vertices of } G\}$. The *girth* of G, denoted by $gr(G)$, is the length of a shortest cycle in G ($gr(G) = \infty$ if G contains no cycles). We use n-cycle to denote the cycle with n vertices, where $n \geq 3$. Also, we denote the complete graph on n vertices by K_n. A *null graph* is a graph containing no edges. We use $\overline{K_n}$ to denote the null graph of order n. The *disjoint union* of two vertex-disjoint graphs G_1 and G_2, which is denoted by $G_1 \cup G_2$, is a graph with $V(G_1 \cup G_2) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ and $E(G_1 \cup G_2) = E(G_1) \cup E(G_2)$. An *independent set* is a subset of the vertices of a graph such that no vertices are adjacent. The number of vertices in a maximum independent set of G is called the *independence number* of G and is denoted by $\alpha(G)$. A *dominating set* is a subset S of $V(G)$ such that every vertex of $V(G) \setminus S$ is adjacent to at least one vertex in S. The number of vertices in a smallest dominating set denoted by $\gamma(G)$, is called the *domination number* of G. Recall that a k-edge coloring of G is an assignment of k colors $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ to the edges of G such that no two adjacent edges have the same color, and the *chromatic index* of G, $\chi'(G)$, is the smallest integer k such that G has a k-edge coloring.

In [9], the authors were mainly interested in the study of intersection graph of ideals of $\mathbb{Z}_m$. For instance, they determined the values of m for which $G(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is connected, complete, Eulerian or has a cycle. In this article, we generalize these results to $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ and also, we find some new results. In Section 2, we compute its girth, independence

number, domination number and maximum degree. We also determine all integer numbers n and m for which $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a forest. In Section 3, we investigate the chromatic index of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. In the last section, we determine all integer numbers n and m for which $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is Eulerian.

2 Basic Properties of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$

Let $n, m > 1$ be integers and $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. Clearly, $\mathbb{Z}_n$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module if and only if n divides m. Throughout the paper, without loss of generality, we assume that $m = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_s^{\alpha_s}$ and $n = p_1^{\beta_1} \cdots p_s^{\beta_s}$, where p_i's are distinct primes, α_i's are positive integers, β_i's are non-negative integers, and $0 \leq \beta_i \leq \alpha_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, s$. Let $S = \{1, \ldots, s\}$, $S' = \{i \in S \ : \ \beta_i \neq 0\}$. The cardinality of S' is denoted by s'. Also, we denote the least common multiple of integers a and b by $[a, b]$. We write $a|b$ ($a \nmid b$ if a divides b (a does not divide b). We begin with a simple example.

Example 1. Let $m = 12$. Then we have the following graphs.



$G(\mathbb{Z}_{12})$ $G_2(\mathbb{Z}_{12})$ $G_3(\mathbb{Z}_{12})$ $G_4(\mathbb{Z}_{12})$

Remark 1. It is easy to see that $I(\mathbb{Z}_m) = \{d\mathbb{Z}_m : d \text{ divides } m\}$ and $|I(\mathbb{Z}_m)^*| = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i + 1) - 2$. Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. If $n|d$, then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is an isolated vertex of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. Obviously, $d_1\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $d_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ are adjacent in $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ if and only if $n \nmid [d_1, d_2]$. This implies that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a subgraph of $G(\mathbb{Z}_m)$.

By [3, Theorem 2.5], we have $gr(G(\mathbb{Z}_m)) \in \{3, \infty\}$. We extend this result to $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. Then $gr(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) \in \{3, \infty\}$.*

Proof. With no loss of generality assume that $S' = \{1, \ldots, s'\}$. Clearly, if $s' \geq 3$, then $p_1\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_1p_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ is a 3-cycle in $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. Therefore $gr(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = 3$. Now, consider two following cases:

Case 1. $s' = 2$. If $s \geq 3$, then $p_1\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_3\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_1p_3\mathbb{Z}_m$ is a 3-cycle in $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. So we may assume that $s = 2$. If $\alpha_i \geq 3$ for some i, $i = 1, 2$, then $p_i\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_i^2\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_i^3\mathbb{Z}_m$ is a 3-cycle in $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. Also, if $\beta_i \geq 2$ for some i, $i = 1, 2$, then $p_1\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_1p_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ is a 3-cycle in $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. Now, assume that $n = p_1p_2$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 = 1, 2$. It is easy to see that $gr(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \infty$. Note that $G_{p_1p_2}(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1p_2}) \cong \overline{K_2}$, $G_{p_1p_2}(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^2p_2}) \cong K_2 \cup \overline{K_2}$, and $G_{p_1p_2}(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^2p_2^2}) \cong K_2 \cup K_2 \cup \overline{K_3}$.

Case 2. $s' = 1$. If $s \geq 3$, then $p_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_3\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_2p_3\mathbb{Z}_m$ is a 3-cycle in $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. So assume that $s = 2$. If $\beta_1 \geq 2$, then $p_1\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_1p_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ is a 3-cycle in $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. Also, if $\alpha_2 \geq 3$, then $p_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_2^2\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_2^3\mathbb{Z}_m$ is a 3-cycle in $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. Now, suppose that $n = p_1$ and $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2$ or $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2^2$. Then $gr(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \infty$, since $G_{p_1}(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2}) \cong \overline{K_{2\alpha_1}}$ and $G_{p_1}(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2^2}) \cong \overline{K_{3\alpha_1-1}} \cup K_2$. Finally, assume that $n = p_1^{\beta_1}$ and $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}$. If $\beta_1 \geq 4$, then $p_1\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_1^2\mathbb{Z}_m$ — $p_1^3\mathbb{Z}_m$ is a 3-cycle in $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. It is easy to see that if $\beta_1 \leq 3$, then $gr(G_{p_1^{\beta_1}}(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{\alpha_1}})) = \infty$. □

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 1, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. Then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a forest if and only if one of the following holds:*

(i) $n = p_1p_2$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2^{\alpha_2}$ *and* $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \leq 2$.

(ii) $n = p_1$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2^{\alpha_2}$ *and* $\alpha_2 \leq 2$.

(iii) $n = p_1^{\beta_1}$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}$ *and* $1 \leq \beta_1 \leq 3$.

By [3, Theorem 3.4], we find that $G(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a tree if and only if $G(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a star. Now, we have a similar result.

Corollary 2. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. Then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a tree if and only if $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a star. In particular, $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a tree if and only if one of the following holds:*

(i) $n = m = p_1^2$.

(ii) $n = m = p_1^3$.

(iii) $n = p_1$ *and* $m = p_1^2$.

By Corollary 1, we can characterize the values of n and m for which $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a null graph.

Corollary 3. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. Then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a null graph if and only if one of the following holds:*

(i) $n = p_1$ *and* $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2$.

(ii) $n = p_1$ *and* $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}$.

(iii) $n = p_1^2$ *and* $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}$.

(iv) $n = m = p_1p_2$.

Throughout the rest of this paper, we use $\mathfrak{A}$ to denote the set of all isolated vertices of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. If $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph, then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is an isolated vertex of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ if and only if $n|d$, except for the case $n = p_1p_2$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2$ and $\alpha_1 \geq 2$, in which case $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) = K_{\alpha_1} \cup \overline{K_{\alpha_1}}$.*

Proof. Clearly, if $n|d$, then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is an isolated vertex of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. For the other side suppose that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph, $d = p_1^{r_1}\cdots p_s^{r_s}$ is a divisor of m and $n \nmid d$. Since $n \nmid d$, we may assume that $r_1 < \beta_1$. If $s \geq 3$, then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is adjacent to one of $p_2^{\alpha_2}\cdots p_s^{\alpha_s}\mathbb{Z}_m$ or $p_3^{\alpha_3}\cdots p_s^{\alpha_s}\mathbb{Z}_m$. Now, suppose that $s = 2$. If $r_1 \neq 0$, then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $p_2^{\alpha_2}\mathbb{Z}_m$ are adjacent. Hence $r_1 = 0$ and $d = p_2^{r_2}$. If $r_2 \geq 2$, then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $p_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ are adjacent. Therefore $d = p_2$. If $\beta_1 \geq 2$, then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $p_1\mathbb{Z}_m$ are adjacent. Thus $\beta_1 = 1$. If $\alpha_2 \geq 2$, then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $p_2^2\mathbb{Z}_m$ are adjacent. So $\alpha_2 = 1$. Then $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2$ and $n = p_1$ or $n = p_1p_2$. If $n = p_1$, then by Corollary 3, $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a null graph, a contradiction. Therefore $n = p_1p_2$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2$ and $\alpha_1 \geq 2$, in which case $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is an isolated vertex of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{A} = \{p_1^{r_1}p_2\mathbb{Z}_m : 0 \leq r_1 \leq \alpha_1 - 1\}$ and $V(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) \setminus \mathfrak{A} = \{p_1^{r_1}\mathbb{Z}_m : 1 \leq r_1 \leq \alpha_1\}$. Clearly, $p_1^{r_1}\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $p_1^{r_2}\mathbb{Z}_m$ are adjacent, where $1 \leq r_1 < r_2 \leq \alpha_1$. This implies that $G_{p_1p_2}(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2}) = K_{\alpha_1} \cup \overline{K_{\alpha_1}}$, where $\alpha_1 \geq 2$. Next, suppose that $s = 1$. Since $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph, by Corollary 3, we conclude that $\beta_1 \geq 3$. Therefore $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is adjacent to $p_1\mathbb{Z}_m$ or $p_1^2\mathbb{Z}_m$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. If $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph, then*

$$|\mathfrak{A}| = \begin{cases} \alpha_1, & \text{if } n = p_1p_2,\ m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2 \text{ and } \alpha_1 \geq 2; \\ \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1) - 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Lemma 1, we know that if $n = p_1p_2$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2$ and $\alpha_1 \geq 2$, then $|\mathfrak{A}| = \alpha_1$. Otherwise, from Lemma 1, we find that $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is an isolated vertex of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ if and only

if n divides d. So $\mathfrak{A} = \{d\mathbb{Z}_m : n \text{ divides } d,\ d \text{ divides } m,\ d \neq m\} = \{p_1^{r_1} \cdots p_s^{r_s}\mathbb{Z}_m : \beta_i \leq r_i \leq \alpha_i\} \setminus \{0\}$. This implies that $|\mathfrak{A}| = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1) - 1$ and the proof is complete.□

Corollary 4. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. Then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ contains no isolated vertex if and only if $n = m \neq p_1, p_1^2, p_1p_2$.*

Proof. One side is obvious. For the other side assume that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ contains no isolated vertex. Hence $n = m$. By Corollary 3 and Lemma 2, it is clear that $m \neq p_1, p_1^2, p_1p_2$. □

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. If $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph, then*

$$\alpha(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \begin{cases} \alpha_1 + 1, & \text{if } n = p_1p_2,\ m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2 \text{ and } \alpha_1 \geq 2; \\ \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1) - 1 + s', & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Lemma 1, it is clear that if $n = p_1p_2$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2$ and $\alpha_1 \geq 2$, then $\alpha(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \alpha_1 + 1$. Otherwise, with no loss of generality we may assume that $S' = \{1, \ldots, s'\}$. Let $B = \mathfrak{A} \cup \left\{p_j^{\beta_j - 1}\prod_{i \neq j} p_i^{\alpha_i}\mathbb{Z}_m : 1 \leq j \leq s'\right\}$. Obviously, $n \nmid p_j^{\beta_j - 1}\prod_{i \neq j} p_i^{\alpha_i}$, for every j, $1 \leq j \leq s'$. Hence by Lemma 1, $p_j^{\beta_j - 1}\prod_{i \neq j} p_i^{\alpha_i}\mathbb{Z}_m$ is not an isolated vertex, for every j, $1 \leq j \leq s'$. Also, it is easy to see that B is an independent set and so $\alpha(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) \geq |\mathfrak{A}| + s' = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1) - 1 + s'$. Moreover, if C is an independent set of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$ and $|C| \geq s' + 1$, then by Pigeonhole Principle we conclude that there exist $\prod_{i=1}^{s} p_i^{r_i}\mathbb{Z}_m, \prod_{i=1}^{s} p_i^{r_i'}\mathbb{Z}_m \in C$ such that $r_j, r_j' < \beta_j$, for some j, $1 \leq j \leq s'$. This implies that $\prod_{i=1}^{s} p_i^{r_i}\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $\prod_{i=1}^{s} p_i^{r_i'}\mathbb{Z}_m$ are adjacent, which is impossible. Therefore

$$\alpha(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1) - 1 + s'.$$

□

We denote $\{i \in S : r_i < \beta_i\}$ by D_d, where $d = p_1^{r_1} \cdots p_s^{r_s}$ is a divisor of m. Obviously, $D_d \subseteq S'$.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module and $d = p_1^{r_1} \cdots p_s^{r_s} (\neq 1, m)$ be a divisor of m. If n divides d, then $deg(d\mathbb{Z}_m) = 0$ and otherwise*

$$deg(d\mathbb{Z}_m) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i + 1) - 2 - \prod_{i \notin D_d}(\alpha_i + 1)\prod_{i \in D_d}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1).$$

Proof. If $n|d$, then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is an isolated vertex and so $deg(d\mathbb{Z}_m) = 0$. Assume that n does not divide d. Then D_d is nonempty. Clearly, $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $p_1^{t_1}\cdots p_s^{t_s}\mathbb{Z}_m$ are not adjacent if and only if $t_i \geq \beta_i$ for each $i \in D_d$. Thus the number of vertices not adjacent to $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is $\prod_{i\notin D_d}(\alpha_i+1)\prod_{i\in D_d}(\alpha_i-\beta_i+1)-1$ and hence the number of its neighbors is $\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-2-\prod_{i\notin D_d}(\alpha_i+1)\prod_{i\in D_d}(\alpha_i-\beta_i+1)$. □

Theorem 4. *Suppose that $\mathbb{Z}_n$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module and $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph. If $n = p_1\cdots p_s$, then $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-2-(\alpha_1+1)\prod_{i=2}^{s}\alpha_i$, where $\alpha_1 \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_s$ and otherwise $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-2-\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i-\beta_i+1)$.*

Proof. First, suppose that $n = p_1\cdots p_s$. By Theorem 3, if $d = p_1^{r_1}\cdots p_s^{r_s}$ is a divisor of m and n does not divide d, then $deg(d\mathbb{Z}_m) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-2-\prod_{i\notin D_d}(\alpha_i+1)\prod_{i\in D_d}\alpha_i$. If $\alpha_1 \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_s$, then $deg(d\mathbb{Z}_m) = \Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m))$ if and only if $\prod_{i\notin D_d}(\alpha_i+1)\prod_{i\in D_d}\alpha_i = (\alpha_1+1)\prod_{i=2}^{s}\alpha_i$. Let $\{i \in S : \alpha_i = \alpha_1\} = \{1,\ldots,k\}$ for some k, $1 \leq k \leq s$. In fact, $\{p_i^{r_i}\mathbb{Z}_m : 1 \leq i \leq k,\ 1 \leq r_i \leq \alpha_i\}$ is the set of all vertices with maximum degree. So $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-2-(\alpha_1+1)\prod_{i=2}^{s}\alpha_i$.

Now, assume that there is an integer j such that $\beta_j \neq 1$. We claim that there exist some vertices adjacent to all non-isolated vertices and so $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-2-\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i-\beta_i+1)$. If $\beta_j = 0$, then $p_j\mathbb{Z}_m$ is adjacent to all non-isolated vertices. Otherwise, $\beta_j \geq 2$. With no loss of generality suppose that $S' = \{1,\ldots,s'\}$. Let $d = p_1^{\beta_1-1}\cdots p_{s'}^{\beta_{s'}-1}$. Then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is adjacent to all non-isolated vertices. The claim is proved. □

Theorem 5. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. Then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ has a vertex which is adjacent to all other vertices if and only if $n = m$ and $\alpha_j \geq 2$, for some j, $1 \leq j \leq s$.*

Proof. If $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ has a vertex which is adjacent to all other vertices, then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ has not any isolated vertex. This implies that $n = m$. By contradiction suppose that $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_s = 1$. Let $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ be a vertex of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ such that it is adjacent to all other vertices. With no loss of generality, we may assume that $d = p_1\cdots p_t$, where $1 \leq t < s$. Let $d' = p_{t+1}\cdots p_s$. It is easy to see that $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $d'\mathbb{Z}_m$ are non-adjacent, a contradiction. Therefore $\alpha_j \geq 2$, for some j, $1 \leq j \leq s$. Conversely, if $n = m$ and $\alpha_j \geq 2$, for some j, $1 \leq j \leq s$, then by Corollary 4, $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ has no isolated vertex. Also, in view of the proof of Theorem 4, we find that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ has a vertex which is adjacent to all other vertices.□

The following corollary is a generalization of [9, Theorem 2.9].

Corollary 5. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. Then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a complete graph if and only if $n = m = p_1^{\alpha_1}$ and $\alpha_1 \geq 2$.*

Proof. Suppose that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a complete graph. By Theorem 5, we find that $n = m$ and $\alpha_j \geq 2$, for some j, $1 \leq j \leq s$. If $s \geq 2$, then $p_s^{\alpha_s}\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} p_i^{\alpha_i}\mathbb{Z}_m$ are two non-adjacent vertices which is a contradiction. Therefore $n = m = p_1^{\alpha_1}$ and $\alpha_1 \geq 2$. The other side is obvious. □

Theorem 6. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. If $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph, then*

$$\gamma(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \begin{cases} |\mathfrak{A}| + 1, & \text{if } n \neq p_1 \cdots p_s \text{ or } n = p_1p_2,\ m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2 \text{ and } \alpha_1 \geq 2; \\ |\mathfrak{A}| + 2, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Suppose that $n \neq p_1 \cdots p_s$. In view of the proof of Theorem 4, $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ has a vertex which is adjacent to every non-isolated vertices. This implies that $\gamma(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = |\mathfrak{A}| + 1$. Next, assume that $n = p_1 \cdots p_s$. If $s = 1$, then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a null graph. Now, assume that $s \geq 2$. If $n = p_1p_2$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2$ and $\alpha_1 \geq 2$, then by Lemma 1, $\gamma(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = |\mathfrak{A}| + 1$. Otherwise, let $B = \{p_1\mathbb{Z}_m, p_2 \cdots p_s\mathbb{Z}_m\}$. If $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is a non-isolated vertex, then n does not divide d. If $p_1 \nmid d$, then $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is adjacent to $p_2 \cdots p_s\mathbb{Z}_m$. Otherwise, $p_j \nmid d$, for some j, $2 \leq j \leq s$. Therefore $p_j \nmid [d, p_1]$. This yields that $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is adjacent to $p_1\mathbb{Z}_m$. Therefore B is a dominating set for $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$. Now, we claim that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ has not a vertex which is adjacent to every non-isolated vertices. By contradiction, suppose that $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ is adjacent to every non-isolated vertices. Since $n \nmid d$, we may assume that $d = p_1 \cdots p_t$, where $1 \leq t < s$. Let $d' = p_{t+1} \cdots p_s$. Clearly, $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $d'\mathbb{Z}_m$ are non-adjacent. Since $n \nmid d$, by Theorem 1, $d'\mathbb{Z}_m$ is not an isolated vertex, a contradiction. Thus $\gamma(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = |\mathfrak{A}| + 2$. □

3 Chromatic Index of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$

In this section, we study the chromatic index of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. First, we need the following theorems:

Theorem A. [8, Theorem 17.4] (Vizing's Theorem) If G is a simple graph, then either $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)$ or $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G) + 1$.

Theorem B. [7, Corollary 5.4] Let G be a simple graph. Suppose that for every vertex

u of maximum degree, there exists an edge u — v such that $\Delta(G) - deg(v) + 2$ is more than the number of vertices with maximum degree in G. Then $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)$.

Theorem C. [11, Theorem D] If G has order $2k$ and maximum degree $2k-1$, then $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)$. If G has order $2k+1$ and maximum degree $2k$, then $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)+1$ if and only if the size of G is at least $2k^2+1$.

Theorem 7. *Suppose that $\mathbb{Z}_n$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module and $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph. If $n = p_1^{\beta_1}$, then $\chi'(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m))$ if and only if $\beta_1 \prod_{i=2}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)$ is an odd integer.*

Proof. Clearly, the set of all non-isolated vertices of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is equal to $\{d\mathbb{Z}_m : d = p_1^{r_1}\cdots p_s^{r_s}, d \neq 1,\ 0 \leq r_1 \leq \beta_1 - 1$ and $0 \leq r_i \leq \alpha_i$ for $i = 2, \ldots, s\}$. So $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$ is a complete graph of order $\beta_1 \prod_{i=2}^{s}(\alpha_i+1) - 1$. The result, now, follows from [4, Theorem 5.11]. □

Theorem 8. *Suppose that $\mathbb{Z}_n$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module and $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph. If $n = p_1p_2$ and $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2^{\alpha_2}$, then $\chi'(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m))$ if and only if $max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ is an even integer.*

Proof. If $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1$, then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a null graph. If $\alpha_1 = 1$ and $\alpha_2 \geq 2$, then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \cong K_{\alpha_2} \cup \overline{K_{\alpha_2}}$. If $\alpha_2, \alpha_2 \geq 2$, then assume that $B_i = \{p_i^{r_i}\mathbb{Z}_m : 1 \leq r_i \leq \alpha_i\}$, for $i = 1, 2$. Clearly, $B_1 \cup B_2$ is the set of all non-isolated vertices of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$, every B_i forms a complete graph and $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$ is the disjoint union of them. Therefore $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A} \cong K_{\alpha_1} \cup K_{\alpha_2}$. Now, [4, Theorem 5.11] completes the proof. □

Theorem 9. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. If $n = p_1 \cdots p_s$ and $s \geq 3$, then $\chi'(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m))$.*

Proof. With no loss of generality assume that $\alpha_1 \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_s$. Let $\{i \in S : \alpha_i = \alpha_1\} = \{1, \ldots, k\}$ for some k, $1 \leq k \leq s$. By Theorem 4, we know that $\{p_i^{r_i}\mathbb{Z}_m : 1 \leq i \leq k,\ 1 \leq r_i \leq \alpha_i\}$ is the set of all vertices with maximum degree. Hence $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ has $k\alpha_1$ vertices with maximum degree. On the other hand, we know that $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1) - 2 - (\alpha_1+1)\prod_{i=2}^{s}\alpha_i$ and $deg(p_1\cdots p_{s-1}\mathbb{Z}_m) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1) - 2 - \alpha_s\prod_{i=1}^{s-1}(\alpha_i+1)$. It is easy to check that if $s \geq 4$, then $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) - deg(p_1\cdots p_{s-1}\mathbb{Z}_m) + 2$ is more than $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_s$ and so $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) - deg(p_1\cdots p_{s-1}\mathbb{Z}_m) + 2$ is more than the number of

vertices with maximum degree. Note that $deg(p_s^{r_s}\mathbb{Z}_m) = \Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m))$ $(1 \leq r_s \leq \alpha_s)$ if and only if $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_s$. Also, if $s \geq 4$, then $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) - deg(p_2 \cdots p_s\mathbb{Z}_m) + 2$ is more than $s\alpha_1$. Therefore by Theorem B, we find that $\chi'(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m))$. Now, consider $s = 3$. If $\alpha_3 \geq 2$, then it is easy to see that $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) - deg(p_1 \cdots p_{s-1}\mathbb{Z}_m) + 2$ is more than $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$ and the proof is complete. Therefore assume that $\alpha_3 = 1$. There are two following cases:

Case 1. $\alpha_2 = 1$. If $\alpha_1 = 1$, then $n = m$ and so $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) = G(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. One can easily check that $\chi'(G(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1p_2p_3})) = \Delta(G(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1p_2p_3})) = 4$ (see [9, Fig. 3]). If $\alpha_1 \geq 2$, then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ has α_1 vertices with maximum degree. Also, $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) - deg(p_1p_3\mathbb{Z}_m) + 2$ is more than α_1 and the result, follows from Theorem B.

Case 2. $\alpha_2 \geq 2$. In this case, it is easy to see that $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) - deg(p_2p_3\mathbb{Z}_m) + 2$ is more than $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. Also, $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) - deg(p_1p_3\mathbb{Z}_m) + 2$ is more than $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ and the result, follows from Theorem B. □

Theorem 10. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. If $n \neq p_1 \cdots p_s$ and $s \geq 2$, then $\chi'(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m))$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4, we know that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ has $\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i + 1) - 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1)$ non-isolated vertices and $\Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-2-\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i-\beta_i+1)$. Hence by Theorem C, we find that $\chi'(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m))$, where $\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-1-\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i-\beta_i+1)$ is even. Next, assume that $\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i + 1) - 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1)$ is odd. Since the size of a complete graph of order $2k + 1$ is $2k^2 + k$, if we prove that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$, in this case, losses at least $k = \big(\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i + 1) - 2 - \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1)\big)/2$ edges, then by Theorem C, $\chi'(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m))$. Let $d = \prod_{i=1}^{s} p_i^{r_i}$ be a divisor of m such that $n \nmid d$ and $\{i \in S' : r_i \geq \beta_i\} \neq \varnothing$. Let $\{i \in S' : r_i \geq \beta_i\} = \{1, \ldots, t\}$. Set $\overline{d} = \prod_{i=t+1}^{s'} p_i^{\beta_i} \prod_{i=s'+1}^{s} p_i^{r_i}$. It is easy to check that $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $\overline{d}\mathbb{Z}_m$ are not adjacent. So we conclude that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ losses at least $\big(\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1) - \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1) - \prod_{i=1}^{s'}\beta_i \prod_{i=s'+1}^{s}(\alpha_i + 1)\big)/2$ edges. We continue the proof in the following two cases:

Case 1. $\beta_i \geq 2$, for some i, $1 \leq i \leq s'$. With no loss of generality we may assume that $\beta_{s'} \geq 2$. Suppose that $B = \Big\{p_1^{r_1}\prod_{i=2}^{s'} p_i^{\beta_i}\mathbb{Z}_m : 0 \leq r_1 \leq \beta_1 - 1\Big\}$ and $C = \Big\{p_1^{\beta_1}\prod_{i=2}^{s} p_i^{r_i}\mathbb{Z}_m : 0 \leq r_i \leq \beta_i - 1,$ for $2 \leq i \leq s'$ and otherwise $0 \leq r_i \leq \alpha_i\Big\}$. Clearly, every element of B is not adjacent to every element of C. This implies that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ losses at least $\prod_{i=1}^{s'}\beta_i \prod_{i=s'+1}^{s}(\alpha_i + 1) - (\prod_{i=2}^{s'}\beta_i + \beta_1 - 1)$ new edges. Therefore $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ losses at least $l = (\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i-\beta_i+1)+\prod_{i=1}^{s'}\beta_i\prod_{i=s'+1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1))/2-(\prod_{i=2}^{s'}\beta_i+\beta_1-1)$ edges. It suffices we prove that $k \leq l$. One can easily see that $k \leq l$ if and only if $2(\beta_1-2) \leq (\beta_1\prod_{i=s'+1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-2)\prod_{i=2}^{s'}\beta_i$. Since $\beta_{s'} \geq 2$, so $2(\beta_1-2) \leq (\beta_1\prod_{i=s'+1}^{s}(\alpha_i+$

$1) - 2)\prod_{i=2}^{s'}\beta_i$ and hence $k \leq l$.

Case 2. $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_{s'} = 1$. Clearly, $\prod_{i=2}^{s'} p_i\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $p_1\prod_{i=s'+1}^{s} p_i^{r_i}\mathbb{Z}_m$ are non-adjacent, where $0 \leq r_i \leq \alpha_i$, for $i = s'+1, \ldots, s$. This implies that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ losses at least $\prod_{i=s'+1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)-1$ new edges. Therefore $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ losses at least $l = (\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1) - \prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i-\beta_i+1) + \prod_{i=s'+1}^{s}(\alpha_i+1))/2 - 1$ edges. In this case, $k \leq l$ is obvious and the proof is complete. □

From the above theorems, we can deduce the next result.

Corollary 6. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. If $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph, then $\chi'(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)) = \Delta(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m))$, unless the following cases:*

(i) $n = p_1^{\beta_1}$ and $\beta_1\prod_{i=2}^{s}(\alpha_i+1)$ is even.

(ii) $n = p_1p_2$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2^{\alpha_2}$ and $max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ is odd.

4 Eulerian Tour in $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$

An *Eulerian tour* in a graph is a closed trail including all the edges of the graph. A graph is *Eulerian* if it has an Eulerian tour. By [8, Theorem 4.1], a simple connected graph is Eulerian if and only if it has no vertices of odd degree. In this section, we determine all integer numbers n and m for which $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$ is an Eulerian graph. We start with the following theorem.

Theorem 11. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module. If $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph, then $diam(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)\setminus \mathfrak{A}) \leq 4$, except for the case $n = p_1p_2$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2^{\alpha_2}$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \geq 2$, in which case $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A} \cong K_{\alpha_1} \cup K_{\alpha_2}$.*

Proof. Assume that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph. In view of the proof of Theorem 6, we conclude that if $n \neq p_1 \cdots p_s$, then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$ is connected and $diam(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}) \leq 2$. Now, suppose that $n = p_1 \cdots p_s$. Since $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph, so $s \neq 1$. First assume that $s \geq 3$. By the proof of Theorem 6, we know that $\{p_1\mathbb{Z}_m, p_2 \cdots p_s\mathbb{Z}_m\}$ is a dominating set for $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$. Since $s \geq 3$, $p_2\mathbb{Z}_m$ is adjacent to both $p_1\mathbb{Z}_m$ and $p_2 \cdots p_s\mathbb{Z}_m$. This implies that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$ is connected and $diam(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}) \leq 4$. Next, assume that $s = 2$. By Lemma 1, if $n = p_1p_2$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2$ and $\alpha_1 \geq 2$, then $diam(G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}) = 1$. Now, consider $n = p_1p_2$, $m = p_1^{\alpha_1}p_2^{\alpha_2}$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \geq 2$. As we saw in the proof of Theorem 8, $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A} \cong K_{\alpha_1} \cup K_{\alpha_2}$ and the proof is complete. □

Now, we are in a position to generalize Theorem 5.1 of [9].

Theorem 12. *Suppose that $\mathbb{Z}_n$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_m$-module and $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph. Then $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$ is an Eulerian graph if and only if one of the following holds:*

(i) α_i and β_i are even integers for each i, $1 \leq i \leq s$.

(ii) α_i is an odd integer and β_i is an even integer for some i, $1 \leq i \leq s$.

(iii) $n = p_1 \cdots p_s$ and $m = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_s^{\alpha_s}$, where α_i' are odd integers and $s \geq 3$.

(iv) $n = p_1 p_2$ and $m = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2$, where $\alpha_1 > 1$ is an odd integer.

Proof. By Theorem 3, $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$ is an Eulerian graph if and only if for each non-isolated vertex $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ both $\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i + 1)$ and $\prod_{i \notin D_d}(\alpha_i + 1)\prod_{i \in D_d}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1)$ are even or odd integers. So the "if" part of theorem is obvious. For the converse, suppose that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$ is an Eulerian graph. First assume that both $\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i + 1)$ and $\prod_{i \notin D_d}(\alpha_i + 1)\prod_{i \in D_d}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1)$ are odd integers for a vertex $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$. Thus all α_i' are even integers. If β_i is an odd integer for some i, $1 \leq i \leq s$, then there exists a vertex $d'\mathbb{Z}_m$ such that $D_{d'} = \{i\}$. (Note that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is not a null graph.) So $\prod_{i \notin D_{d'}}(\alpha_i + 1)\prod_{i \in D_{d'}}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1)$ is an even integer which implies that $deg(d'\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is an odd integer, a contradiction. Therefore β_i is an even integer for each i, $1 \leq i \leq s$. Next, assume that both $\prod_{i=1}^{s}(\alpha_i + 1)$ and $\prod_{i \notin D_d}(\alpha_i + 1)\prod_{i \in D_d}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1)$ are odd integers for a vertex $d\mathbb{Z}_m$ of $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$. Hence α_i is an odd integer for some i, $1 \leq i \leq s$. With no loss of generality suppose that $\{i \in S : \alpha_i \text{ is an odd integer}\} = \{1, \ldots, t\}$, where $1 \leq t \leq s$. Suppose that $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_t$ are odd integers. If $n = p_1 \cdots p_s$ and $m = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_s^{\alpha_s}$, where α_i' are odd integers, then we are done. (Note that $G_n(\mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \mathfrak{A}$ is a connected graph.) Otherwise there exists a vertex $d'\mathbb{Z}_m$ such that $D_{d'} = \{1, \ldots, t\}$. So $\prod_{i \notin D_{d'}}(\alpha_i + 1)\prod_{i \in D_{d'}}(\alpha_i - \beta_i + 1)$ is an odd integer which implies that $deg(d'\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is an odd integer, a contradiction. Thus β_i is an even integer for some i, $1 \leq i \leq t$. The proof is complete. □

References

[1] S. Akbari, S. Khojasteh, Commutative rings whose cozero-divisor graphs are unicyclic or of bounded degree, *Comm. Algebra*, **42** (2014), 1594–1605.

[2] S. Akbari, S. Khojasteh, A. Yousefzadehfard, The proof of a conjecture in Jacobson graph of a commutative ring, J. Algebra Appl., Vol. 14, No. 10 (2015) 1550107.

[3] S. Akbari, H.A. Tavallaee, S. Khalashi Ghezelahmad, Intersection graph of submodules of a module, *J. Algebra Appl.* **11** (2012), Article No. 1250019.

[4] I. Anderson, *A First Course in Discrete Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, 2001.

[5] D.F. Anderson, P.S. Livingston, The zero-divisor graph of a commutative ring, *J. Algebra*, **217** (1999), 434–447.

[6] S.E. Atani, A. Yousefian Darani, E.R. Puczylowski, On the diameter and girth of ideal-based zero-divisor graphs, Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen, 78:3-4 (2011) 607–612.

[7] L.W. Beineke, B.J. Wilson, *Selected Topics in Graph Theory*, Academic Press Inc., London, 1978.

[8] J.A. Bondy, U.S.R. Murty, *Graph Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 244 Springer, New York, 2008.

[9] I. Chakrabarty, S. Ghosh, T.K. Mukherjee, M.K. Sen, Intersection graphs of ideals of rings, *Discrete Mathematics*, **309** (2009), 5381–5392

[10] B. Csákány and G. Pollák, The graph of subgroups of a finite group (Russian), *Czech. Math. J.* **19** (1969), 241–247.

[11] M.J. Plantholt, The chromatic index of graphs with large maximum degree, *Discrete Math.* **47** (1981), 91–96.